

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 CARPENTERS SOUTHWEST  
12 ADMINISTRATIVE CORPORATION, a  
13 California non-profit corporation; and  
14 BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE  
15 CARPENTERS SOUTHWEST TRUSTS

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 ACL BUILDERS, INC., a California  
17 corporation,

17 Defendant.  
18

Case No. CV 12-04883-ODW(JEMx)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART MOTION FOR  
DEFAULT JUDGMENT [13]**

19 **I. INTRODUCTION**

20 Plaintiffs Carpenters Southwest Administrative Corporation and Board of  
21 Trustees for the Carpenters Southwest Trusts move the Court to enter default  
22 judgment against Defendant ACL Builders, Inc.<sup>1</sup> (ECF No. 13.) For the following  
23 reasons, the Court **GRANTS in part** and **DENIES in part** Plaintiffs' motion.

24 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

25 On June 12, 2012, Plaintiffs filed a Complaint in this Court alleging two claims  
26 against ACL for (1) damages for failure to pay fringe benefit contributions; and (2)

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Having carefully considered the papers filed in support of the instant Motion, the Court deems this matter appropriate for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-15

1 injunctive relief. (Compl. 1.) Plaintiffs served ACL with the Summons and Complaint  
2 on June 22, 2012. (ECF No. 9, Gifford Decl. ¶ 3, Ex. 3.) After ACL failed to appear or  
3 otherwise respond to the complaint, Plaintiffs requested an entry of default on the  
4 case, which the Clerk of Court entered according to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
5 Rule 55(a) on July 12, 2012. (ECF Nos. 9, 10.) Plaintiffs now move for default  
6 judgment. (ECF No. 13.)

7 This action arises out of ACL's alleged failure to pay fringe-benefit  
8 contributions. Plaintiff Carpenters Southwest Administrative Corporation ("CSAC")  
9 is a non-profit corporation that administers various multiemployer plan trusts.  
10 (Compl. ¶¶ 6, 9.) CSAC is also assignee of various express trusts under section 302 of  
11 the Labor Management Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. § 186, and therefore is the plan  
12 fiduciary. (*Id.*) Plaintiff Board of Trustees for the Carpenters Southwest Trusts  
13 ("Trustees") are the acting trustees of the ERISA trusts administered by CSAC.  
14 (Compl. ¶ 3) Additionally, Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters and its affiliated  
15 local unions associated with the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of  
16 America (collectively, the "Unions") are labor organizations and parties to the  
17 collective bargaining agreements involved in this case. (*Id.* ¶ 11.) ACL is a contractor  
18 engaged in the construction industry. (*Id.* ¶ 12.)

19 In July of 2003, ACL contracted with the Unions to report the number of the  
20 hours worked by each employee and pay fringe-benefit contributions for each hour  
21 worked according to predetermined amounts. (*Id.* ¶¶ 15–17.) This agreement  
22 provides a penalty for failure to report and pay contributions by the 25th of the  
23 month following the work logged. (*Id.*) The multiemployer plans administered by  
24 CSAC are third-party beneficiaries of this agreement. (*Id.* ¶ 15.) CSAC and Trustees  
25 allege that ACL failed to report hours and make contributions required under the  
26 agreement. (*Id.* ¶¶ 19, 20.)

27 ///

28 ///

### III. LEGAL STANDARD

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b) permits a court-ordered default judgment following the Clerk's entry of default under Rule 55(a). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b) and Local Rule 55-1 require that applications for default judgment set forth (1) when and against what party the default was entered; (2) the identification of the pleadings to which the default was entered; and (3) that notice has been served on the defaulting party, if required by Rule 55(b)(2).<sup>2</sup>

The district court is given discretion to decide whether to enter a default judgment. *Aldabe v. Aldabe*, 616 F.2d 1089, 1092 (9th Cir. 1980). Upon default, the defendant's liability generally is conclusively established, and the well-pleaded factual allegations in the complaint—except those pertaining to damages—are accepted as true. *Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917–19 (9th Cir. 1987) (per curiam) (citing *Geddes v. United Fin. Group*, 559 F.2d 557, 560 (9th Cir. 1977)). But in exercising its discretion regarding entry of default, a court must consider several factors, including: (1) the possibility of prejudice to plaintiff; (2) the merits of plaintiff's substantive claim; (2) the sufficiency of the complaint; (4) the sum of money at stake in the action; (5) the possibility of a dispute concerning material facts; (6) whether the defendant's default was due to excusable neglect; and (7) the strong policy underlying the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure favoring decisions on the merits. *Eitel v. McCool*, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471–72 (9th Cir. 1986).

### IV. DISCUSSION

Plaintiffs' Motion for Default Judgment seeks judgment as to liability and an award of damages for failure to pay fringe benefit contributions amounting to \$45,436.78, pre-judgment interest in the amount of \$11,951.74, and attorney's fees in the amount of \$3,326.21. Plaintiffs also seek injunctive relief requiring compliance with the Agreement. The Court considers each in turn.

---

<sup>2</sup> Because ACL is not a person, the Court does not consider whether the defaulting party is incompetent or falls under the Service Member's Relief Act.

1 **A. Liability**

2 Plaintiffs have satisfied the procedural requirements for default judgment  
3 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(a) and Local Rule 55-1. Specifically,  
4 Plaintiffs have established that (1) the clerk entered default against ACL on July 12,  
5 2012; (2) the default is based on ACL's failure to respond to Plaintiffs' Complaint  
6 served on June 16, 2012 (ECF No. 6); and (3) Plaintiffs served ACL with notice of their  
7 application for default judgment by delivering a copy of the Motion and all  
8 supporting documents to ACL's business addresses.

9 Upon entry of default, "well-pled allegations in the complaint regarding  
10 liability are deemed true." *Fair Housing of Marin v. Combs*, 285 F.3d 899, 906 (9th  
11 Cir. 2002). Moreover, the Court finds that consideration of the *Eitel* factors weigh in  
12 favor of granting the motion. *See Eitel*, 782 F.2d at 1471–72. Specifically, Plaintiffs  
13 would suffer prejudice if default judgment is not entered because Plaintiffs "would  
14 be denied the right to judicial resolution of the claims presented, and would be  
15 without other recourse for recovery." *Electra Entm't Grp., Inc. v. Crawford*, 226  
16 F.R.D. 388, 392 (C.D. Cal. 2005). Plaintiffs have established the merits of their claims  
17 and the sufficiency of the Complaint through its pleading and evidence. The sum of  
18 money is not disproportionately large because the damages awarded are governed  
19 by statute. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g) (establishing what damages shall be awarded  
20 under an ERISA plan). Finally, the Court finds that ACL's failure to answer or file a  
21 responsive pleading was not the result of excusable neglect because ACL failed to  
22 respond despite repeated notice of this action. (ECF Nos. 6, 9, 13–17, 19.)

23 Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motion for Default Judgment is **GRANTED** as to liability  
24 for ACL's failure to pay fringe benefit contributions.

25 **B. Statutory Damages**

26 Where judgment has been granted in favor of a plan, statutory damages under  
27 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g)(2) are "mandatory and not discretionary." *Nw. Admin., Inc. v.*  
28 *Albertson's, Inc.*, 104 F.3d 253, 257 (9th Cir. 1996). Section 1132(g)(2) provides that,

1 following entry of judgment in favor of the plan, the Court *shall* award the plan (A)  
 2 unpaid contributions; (B) interest on the unpaid contributions; (C) either interest on  
 3 the contributions again or liquidated damages provided under the plan; (D)  
 4 reasonable attorney's fees and costs; and (E) such other legal and equitable relief the  
 5 Court deems appropriate. Plaintiffs have satisfied their burden of proof on these  
 6 damages with declarations, signed contracts, and hour reports showing delinquent  
 7 payments, as described below. (Petersen Decl., Exs. 1, 6, 7.)

8 *1. Unpaid contributions*

9 Plaintiffs list the four months of insufficient payments in 2010—January,  
 10 February, March, and August—totaling to \$27,476.94 in unpaid contributions  
 11 (Petersen Suppl. Decl. Ex. 7.) For 2011, they note that no payments were received  
 12 from June through November, totaling \$17,959.84 in unpaid contributions. (*Id.*)  
 13 These combined amounts come to **\$45,436.78**.

14 *2. Interest on unpaid contributions*

15 The total amount of interest owing on ACL's payments is calculated according  
 16 to ACL's agreement with Unions. (Petersen Decl. ¶ 21.) The agreement applies a  
 17 7% interest per annum on delinquent payments. (*Id.*) The total amount of interest  
 18 on \$45,436.78 calculated at 7% is **\$5,975.87**.

19 *3. Double interest under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g)(2)(C)*

20 Under § 1132(g)(2)(C), Plaintiffs are entitled to either the amount of liquidated  
 21 damages provided for in the agreement or an additional award of the interest  
 22 accrued, whichever is greater. ACL's agreement with Unions provides for liquidated  
 23 damages at 10% of the delinquent payments, which comes to \$4,543.68. (Petersen  
 24 Decl. ¶ 21.) As established above, the interest is \$5,975.87. The interest being  
 25 greater, the Court must award Plaintiff a second interest award of **\$5,975.87**.

26 *4. Attorney's fees*

27 Local Rule 55-3 states that where a statute provides for reasonable attorney's  
 28 fees, those fees must be calculated according to the schedule provided under that

1 Rule. The total delinquency here is \$45,436.78. Local Rule 55-3's schedule  
 2 establishes that where the amount of judgment is \$10,000.01 to \$50,000, attorney's  
 3 fees are calculated at \$1,200 plus 6% of the amount over \$10,000. This amounts to  
 4 **\$3,326.21.**

5 As to subsection (E), other legal and equitable relief, Plaintiffs have requested  
 6 injunctive relief. This will be discussed below. At this point, the Court **GRANTS**  
 7 Plaintiffs requests under § 1132(g)(2)(A)–(D) as described above, totaling to  
 8 **\$60,714.73.**

### 9 **C. Injunctive Relief**

10 Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief to coerce ACL to comply with its contractual  
 11 duty to make the required payments and file the necessary reports. To obtain  
 12 injunctive relief, Plaintiffs must establish that (1) Plaintiffs have suffered an  
 13 irreparable injury; (2) remedies available at law, such as monetary damages, are  
 14 inadequate to compensate for that injury; (3) considering the balance of hardships  
 15 between Plaintiffs and ACL, a remedy in equity is warranted; and (4) the public  
 16 interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction. *eBay Inc. v.*  
 17 *MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006)

18 This Court is not inclined to grant injunctive relief in this case. By their request  
 19 for an injunction, Plaintiffs seek a court order requiring Defendants to comply with  
 20 their legal obligations under the added threat of being held in contempt of court.  
 21 But Plaintiffs already have a more-than-adequate remedy at law to enforce  
 22 Defendants' obligations, as illustrated by the Court's present grant of default  
 23 judgment. Plaintiffs simply have not suffered an irreparable injury because the  
 24 damages the Court awards them here—and could award them in any future  
 25 proceeding—fully remedy Defendants' violations and cover Plaintiffs' reasonable  
 26 attorney's fees. And without a showing that Plaintiffs have suffered an irreparable  
 27 injury, the threat of criminal penalties for violation of a legal duty is unwarranted.

1 In a feeble attempt to establish irreparable injury, Plaintiffs claim ACL's failure  
2 to make timely contributions may effectively result in another employer (or the  
3 participants) having to pay for the delinquency. (See Petersen Decl. ¶ 20.) They  
4 assert that this is because the Plan's contribution rates and benefits are based on  
5 actuarial calculations, but they do not state how much the damage is or the relative  
6 certainty of any such damage occurring at all. To the contrary, Plaintiffs' claim is  
7 speculative and equivocal, and insufficient to warrant the requested relief.

8 In this first suit against ACL for unpaid contributions, the monetary damages  
9 awarded above are adequate. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motion for Default Judgment is  
10 **DENIED** with respect to injunctive relief.

#### 11 **V. CONCLUSION**

12 For the foregoing reasons, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiffs' Motion for Default  
13 Judgment with respect to unpaid contributions, interest, double interest under 29  
14 U.S.C. 1132(g)(2)(C), and attorney's fees, for a total of \$60,714.73 in damages. The  
15 Court **DENIES** Plaintiffs' Motion with respect to injunctive relief. A judgment will  
16 issue.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18  
19 October 17, 2012

20  
21   
22 **HON. OTIS D. WRIGHT, II**  
23 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28